Larry, Disgusted by the lack of reporting of what is going on in the Watergate courtroom or what would be no better, the lack of understanding of it, and suffering the emotional stimulation of rehashing some of our common (Senate investigator) pasts yesterday with an old friend. I laid aside things I should have done today to do a rough first/summary chapter, complete enough to be the basis of an article should there be a market for one. I sent it to my agent in England, but not with any hope. Before sending I made a copy. Would you like to read it? If you would, I'd appreciate any comments, in the event something does develop. Unless Colson's threatened suit against TIME firms up, I see no real prospect of any real, original work. There has been good work, but almost all of it seems to come from leaks. I suspect the hand of L. Patrick Gray, who would undoubtedly like the "Acting" in his title dropped, as the Post has recommended editorially.The Senate just might do something, of course, but I expect less than enough. It would be good to have something with which to prod it. Hersh's Times piece is the only one I recall that shows personal investigation. Even the LATimes' Baldwin interview added little to what somebody had given the Post. How many do you think were privy to what Baldwin had told the FBI? What other source could the Post have had, if not Baldwin, than someone who had a copy of the FBI work? If you've read what I've sent, you know that only finkery has been contracted for, from finks. And extremist finks at that. Maybe shallow self-justification, red-baiting McGovern. But can you imagine Fiorini, in federal jail, biting the hand that holds the key? Even before the key locks? I do not. Of course, I'd like to be wrong, and I'd like serious, in-depth, over-all treatment to seem possible, going back to how these guys were prepped for this deal. If you can find any optimism, I'd be entertained. HW 1/28/73